

REMARKS

Please make of record and consider French patent application 2 812 927, and the machine translation thereof, that accompany this Amendment in an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS).

Claims 1-10 and 14 have been canceled. Claims 11 and 15 has been amended. New claims 16-23 have been added.

Claims 2-6 were rejected under §112, second paragraph, and have been canceled. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2 and 4-15 were rejected as unpatentable over RIETH EP 0 108 222. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Amended claim 11 includes a single integral piece that is arranged to define a plate for fixing the device to the surface and a support for receiving the perforated section. RIETH discloses two separate pieces (3, 4) that are not a single integral piece. There is no suggestion in the reference to make these two pieces (3, 4) a single integral piece and it is not seen how the device in RIETH would work if the device were so modified. That is, the device in RIETH is assembled by attaching the two separate pieces (3, 4) to the perforated section (5) before the device is attached to the ceiling. The perforated section (5) could not be attached to the two pieces (3, 4) if these pieces were a single integral piece (how would the claws be

inserted?) One of skill in the art would not make this modification because it would render the device in RIETH unfit for its intended purpose.

Claim 11 further provides that each of the two walls has at least two claws, where the claws on one of the walls are bent into the interior space and the claws on the other of the walls are bent away from the interior space (this is seen, for example, in Figure 1 of the present application). RIETH does not disclose this. The claws are all directed into the interior space. Nevertheless, the Official Action indicates that one of skill in the art would find it obvious to reverse the direction of one set of claws to provide maximum connecting interaction with the supports to increase stiffness. If one set of claws in RIETH were reversed and bent away from the interior space, the device in RIETH would not work. The claws on the two walls in RIETH must interact with the perforated section that is between the two walls. The claws must be inwardly directed for the device in RIETH to be operable. Claws directed away from the interior space would not interact with the perforated section and would serve no purpose. Indeed, if one set of claws were directed away from the interior space and did not interact with the perforated section, the connecting interaction would be decreased, not increased as suggested in the Official Action. In addition, it is not clear where the artisan would learn that the connecting interaction would be maximized, as suggested in the

Official Action, by reversing a set of claws because there is nothing in the art to suggest how the connecting interaction is affected by such a change. There must be some concrete evidence of record to motivate the artisan to make the suggested change.

Accordingly, claims 11-13 and 15 avoid the rejection under §103.

New claims 16-23 are allowable for similar reasons. RIETH does not disclose or suggest a device with a support having at least three walls defining an interior space, where each of the walls is integral with the plate. RIETH also does not disclose or suggest first claws that are bent into the interior space and second claws that are bent out of the interior space as claimed.

The new dependent claims further avoid the art because there is no suggestion to the gap of claims 18-21. Separating two of the walls with a gap would decrease structural integrity, not increase it, and one of skill in the art would not include this gap. The references also do not disclose or suggest a perforated section that has a first arm that is inside the interior space and a second arm that is outside the interior space as in claims 19 and 22. RIETH only suggests placing the perforated section inside the interior space. There is nothing in the reference to indicate how one arm could be inside and the other arm outside the interior space between the walls. RIETH does not disclose or suggest the third fold line parallel to the


longitudinal axis of the interior space as in claim 17 or the fourth line as defined in claim 23. There is also no suggestion to extend the gap and attach the walls to each other along an entire length of the support as in claim 21.

In view of the present amendment and the foregoing remarks, it is believed that the present application has been placed in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON



Thomas W. Perkins, Reg. No. 33,027
745 South 23rd Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

TWP/lk